

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 9 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 8, 11-13, 18 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10 and 14-17 are pending in the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bronshvatch et al. (U.S. 5,528,434) (hereinafter "Bronshvatch").

Bronshvatch discloses a disc clamp with an integrated stiffener for hard disc drives. The disc clamp 46 includes a central mounting portion that extends from the center of the disc clamp to a first radius 56. This central mounting portion 54 also includes a plurality of screw holes 58 equally spaced about a circle having a second radius 60 that is less than the first radius 56. The central mounting portion 54 also has a central opening 62. The central mounting portion 54 of the disc clamp 46 is bent downward from the center forming an obtuse conical shape. This conical central mounting portion will be deformed to a flat configuration upon assembly. The disc clamp 46 also includes a stiffening bend 64 immediately outside and defining the extent of the central mounting portion 54. This stiffening bend 64 is actually a compound bend made up of a first bend 66 in the upward direction and a second bend 68 in the downward direction. The configuration of the two simple bends 66, 68 that make up the stiffening bend 64 are selected, along with the material thickness, such that the stiffening bend 64 forms a portion of the disc clamp 46 that is effectively non-bendable under the intended clamping force. Bronshvatch, 5:34 – 5:59.

Immediately outside the radius of the stiffening bend 64 is a spring portion 70 of the disc clamp 46, which is limited radially by a first contact-forming bend 72 again in the downward direction. The amount of bend to bring the plane of the spring portion 70 into parallel with the conical central mounting portion 54, although this parallel relationship is not mandatory. A second contact-forming bend 74 in the upward direction defines a circular contact surface 76 closely adjacent the outer extreme of the disc clamp 46, which is the sole contact between the disc clamp 46 and the uppermost disc in the complete assembly. Bronshvatch, 5:66 – 6:13.

Claims 1-7

Amended claim 1 recites: “...wherein the pressing portion has a profile having a curved shape bulged downward, and a radius of the curved shape of the stress distribution portion is greater than or equal to a radius of the curved shape of the pressing portion.” Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claims 2 and 3. In contrast to claim 1, Bronshvatch does not discuss that the radius of the stress distribution portion is greater than or equal to the radius of the pressing portion. In Bronshvatch, the first contact forming bend (corresponding to the stress distribution portion of claim 1) clearly has a smaller radius than the circular contact surface 76 (corresponding to the pressing portion of claim 1). As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Bronsvatch.

Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. Claims 4-7 are dependent on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has been cancelled.

Claims 9-17

Amended claim 9 recites: “...a radius of the substantially curved shape of the stress distribution portion is greater than or equal to a radius of the substantially curved shape of the pressing portion.” Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claims 11-13. Similar to the argument for claim 1, in contrast to claim 9, Bronshvatch does not discuss that the radius of the stress distribution portion is greater than or equal to the radius of the pressing portion. In Bronshvatch, the first contact forming bend (corresponding to the stress distribution portion of claim 1) clearly has a smaller radius than the circular contact surface 76 (corresponding to the pressing portion of claim 1). As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Bronsvatch.

Claims 11-13 have been cancelled. Claims 10 and 14-17 are dependent on claim 9 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 21, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501